



20 OCT 2005

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Steven J. Hultquist
Intellectual Property/Technology Law
P.O. Box 14329
Research Triangle, NC 27709

In re Application of	:	
HONE, David	:	
U.S. Application No.: 10/525,702	:	
PCT No.: PCT/US03/26200	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Int. Filing Date: 20 August 2003	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)
Priority Date: 20 August 2002	:	
Attorney Docket No.: 4115-178	:	
For: RECOMBINANT DOUBLE-STRANDED	:	
RNA PHAGES AND USES THEREOF	:	

This decision is in response to applicants' "Petition for Acceptance of Declaration and Power of Attorney Executed by Assignee on Behalf of a Non-Signing Inventor in U.S. Patent Application no. 10/525,702" which is being treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) filed 04 October 2005 to accept the application without the signature of the sole inventor, David Hone. The \$200 petition fee has been submitted.

BACKGROUND

On 20 August 2003, applicants filed international application PCT/US03/26200 which claimed a priority date of 20 August 2002. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.495, the thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired at midnight on 20 February 2005.

On 18 February 2005, applicants filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States, which accompanied by, inter alia: the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1); a copy of the international application; and a preliminary amendment.

On 04 August 2005, the United States Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be filed. The notification set a two-month time limit in which to respond.

On 04 October 2005, applicant filed the present petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b).

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the requisite petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17; (2) factual proof that the inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort; (3) a statement of the last known address of the nonsigning inventor; (4) an oath or declaration executed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant on behalf of and as agent for the nonsigning inventor; (5) proof of proprietary interest in the application; and, (6) a showing that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damages. The 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant has satisfied the requirements of items (1) and (4). However, items (2); (3); (5) and (6) have not been satisfied.

Regarding item (2) above, petitioner states that David Hone has refused to sign the application. Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

Petitioner states that David Hone has refused to sign the application. A review of the present petition and the accompanying papers reveal that applicant has not satisfied

item (2) above, in that the applicant has not shown that a bona fide attempt was made to present the application papers, including the specification, claims, and drawings to David Hone. The Affidavit of Olga Stecyk-Aquino states that, "on March 18, 2005 and March 29, 2005, she forwarded a Declaration/Power of Attorney, Confirmation, and Assignment for execution to the nonsigning inventor and that no response was received." The mailing of the Declaration/Power of Attorney is not considered a complete copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath and declaration). Additionally, under these circumstances, where the Office is being asked to accept the silence of the nonsigning inventor's as evidence of a refusal to sign, petitioner must provide some evidence that the application materials have been received by the nonsigning applicant. Further, it appears that the application papers were mailed to Mr. Hone's corporate address. In this situation, the application papers should be submitted to the inventor at his last known home address to insure receipt.

As stated above, where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, a statement of facts is needed from a person having first hand knowledge of the facts that a complete copy of the application papers (specification, claims, and drawings) were sent to David Hone, and when such papers were sent. In addition, copies of documentary evidence such as a certified mail return receipt, cover letters of instruction, telegrams, etc., should be supplied with the declaration.

Regarding item (3) above, a clear statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventor has not been provided. In situations where an inventor does not execute the oath or declaration, the inventor's most recent home address must be given to enable the Office to communicate directly with the inventor as necessary. (See MPEP §605.03)

Concerning Item (5), section 409.03(f) of the M.P.E.P., Proof of Proprietary Interest, states, in part:

When an application is deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must prove that, as of the date the application is deposited in the Patent and Trademark Office, (1) the invention has been assigned to the applicant, or (2) the inventor has agreed in writing to assign the invention to the applicant, or (3) the applicant otherwise has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify the filing of the application.

If the application assigned, a copy of the assignment (in the English Language) must be submitted. The assignment must clearly indicate that the invention described in the 37 CFR 1.47(b) application was assigned to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant prior to the date the application is deposited in the Patent and Trademark Office. A statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) by the assignee must also be submitted (see MPEP § 324) . . .

When an inventor has agreed in writing to assign an invention described in an application deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), a

copy of that agreement should be submitted. If an agreement to assign is dependent on certain specified conditions being met, it must be established by affidavit or declaration that those conditions have been met. A typical agreement to assign is an employment agreement where an employee (nonsigning inventor) agrees to assign to his or her employer (37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant) all inventions made during employment. When such an agreement is relied on, it must be established by the affidavit or declaration of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by the employee while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant.

If the invention has not been assigned, or if there is no written agreement to assign, the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must demonstrate that he or she otherwise has a sufficient proprietary interest in the matter.

A proprietary interest obtained otherwise than by assignment or agreement to assign may be demonstrated by an appropriate legal memorandum to the effect that a court of competent jurisdiction (federal, state, or foreign) would by the weight of authority in that jurisdiction award title of the invention to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant. The facts in support of any conclusion that a court would award title to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant should be made of record by way of an affidavit or declaration of the person having firsthand knowledge of same. The legal memorandum should be prepared and signed by an attorney at law familiar with the law of the jurisdiction involved. A copy (in the English language) of a statute (if other than the United States statute) or a court decision (if other than a reported decision of a federal court or a decision reported in the United States Patents Quarterly) relied on to demonstrate a proprietary interest should be made of record.

Regarding item (5), petitioner has not demonstrated that applicant has a propriety interest in the invention. Petitioner provided a copy of the "University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute Intellectual Property Assignment and Confidential Information Agreement" executed by David Hone. However, the petition does not establish firsthand knowledge of the specific details surrounding the present invention of David Hone, including the specific relationship of the inventive activities of David Hone and his employment with University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute. As stated in section 409.03(f) of the M.P.E.P. when such an employment agreement is relied upon, it must be established by the affidavit or declaration of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by the employee while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant. An affidavit or declaration of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by the employee while employed has not been provided.

Regarding item (6), a showing that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damages has not been provided.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) is DISMISSED without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(b)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to: Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
Office of PCT Legal Administration
Tel: (571) 272-3298
Fax: (571) 273-0459